Patent Attorneys

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

STIENNON & STIENNON MAY 2 4 2006

P.O. Box 1667; Madison, WI 53701-1667; phone (608) 250-4870; Fax (608) 250-4874

This transmission is intended for the exclusive use of the named recipient. If you are not the named recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, copying, disclosure or distribution of the information transmitted herewith may be subject to legal restriction or sanction, and you are requested to notify us by telephone (collect) (608) 250-4870 to arrange for return or destruction of the information and all copies.

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review

Fax to: Examiner Nguyen, Tan D.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Group Art Unit 3629

At Fax No.: (571) 273-8300
USPTO central facsimile number

From: Patrick J. G. Stiennon

Date: May 24, 2006

Time:

Our Ref.: FORSAL-25

This transmission has 10 pages (including this sheet)

There follows in Application No. 09/966,424.

- PTO/SB/21 Transmittal letter (1 p)
- PTO/SB/17 Fee transmittal form (1 p)
- PTO/SB/31 Notice of Appeal From the Examiner to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (1 p)
- PTO/SB/33 Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review (1 p)
- Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review (5 pp)

EINYUN & STIENYUN FAGE 02

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box → #		Patent and Trade	Approved for emark Office:	ILC DE	ugh 9/30/00	TAFCAM	51-003	1
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, n	o respond to a collection of inform Application Number	nation unless it displays a valid OMB control number.						
TRANSMITT	Filing Date	09/966,424 Sept. 28, 2001 REC					En	
FORM		First Named inventor	Kari					CENTER
(To be used for all correspondence of	Group Art Unit	3629		Макус			-	
(To be used for all correspondence a	Examiner Name				MAY	24	2006	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	Attorney Docket Number	+	Nguyen, Tan D. FORSAL-25					
Fee Transmittal Form	Assignment (For an Appli	•	After	То				
Fee Attached	Drawing(s)		Group Appeal Communication to Board Of					
Amendment / Response	Licensing-rei	lated Papers	Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to Group					
After Final	1	ting Slip (PTO/SB/69) panying Petition	(App					
Affidavits/declaration(s)	To Convert a	a Provisional Application	Proprietary Information Status Letter					
Extension of Time Request		mey, Revocation rrespondence Address (Ricean Id.)			nclosure(s	•		
Express Abandonment Request	Terminal Dis	claimer	(Fide	ise ideni	ny bakw)	•		
Information Disclosure Statement	Small Entity		Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review PTO/SB/33 Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review					
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	·							
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Response to Missing Parts	Remarks	The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required with respect to this communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-2663						
Under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	SIGNATURE OF APPI	LICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGEN	T					}
	cick J. G.	Stiennon, Reg.	No. 34	934				_
Signature P	WQ							
Date May 24								1
I hereby certify that this correspondence i		FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION nsmitted to United States Par	tent and			<u> </u>		1
Trademark Office on this date:		May 24, 2006		2006]		
Typed or printed name	Patrick	J. G. Stiennon	, Reg. No. 34934					1
Signature No.	A)	Date	May 24	, 2006			

PTO/SB/17 (12-97)

Approved for use through 09/30/00. OMB 0651-0032
Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Control number.

control number.			- 								
FEE TRANSMITTAL						Application	Numba		omplete if Known 09/966,424	p	ECEIV
						Filing Date			Sept. 28, 200		
						First Name		tor		/ <u> </u>	ML PAX
Note: Effective October 1, 1997,						Group Art			Kari M. Mäki 3629	— <u>k</u>	AY 2 4
Patent fees are subject to annual revision					⊢	Examiner I					AI Z T
TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT \$500.00								mbor	Nguyen, Tan		
			AYMENT (check one)		Attorney D			FORSAL-25 CULATION (Continued)		
1.	The C	ommiss	sioner is hereby autho and credit any over p	rized to char	Э Ө 3. А	DDITIONAL					
Deposit	50-	2663			Le	irge Entity	Sma	II Entity			
Account 30-2663 Number			Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description		Fee Paid		
Deposit	enosit Guitana a Guit			105	130	205	65	Surcharge - late filing fee	or cath		
ccount Name Stiennon & Stiennon				127	50	227	25	Surcharge - late provision			
Charge Any Additional Fee CFR 1.18 at the Mailing of the			n 37 139 the	130	139	130	fee or cover sheet Non-English specification	ı			
Required Under Notice of Allowance 37 CFR 1.18 and 1.17				147	2,520	147	2,520	For filing a request for reexamination			
2.	Payme	ent Encl	losed:		112	920*	112	920*	Requesting publication of	SIR	
_	Che	eck	☐ Money ☐	Other	113	1,840*	113	1,840*	prior to Examiner action Requesting publication of after Examiner action	SIR	
	FEE CALCULATION				115	110	215	55	Extension for reply within month		
1. FILING FEE				116	400	216	200	Extension for reply within month	second		
Large Entity	Small	Entity			117	920	217	460	Extension for reply within month	third	
Fee Fee Code (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid	118	1,440	218	720	Extension for reply within	fourth	
2000 (4)	Ocaç	(4)			128	1960	228	980	month Extension for reply within month	fifth	
101 770	201	385	Utility filing fee		119	320	219	160	Notice of Appeal		\$500.00
06 330	206	165	Design filing fee		120	320	220	160	Filing a brief in support of appeal	an	
107 510	207	255	Plant filing fee		121	280	221	140	Request for oral hearing		
08 740	208	370	Reissue filing fee		138	1,510	138	1,510	Petition to institute a publ	ic use	
14 160	214	80	Provisional filing		140	110	240	55	proceeding Petition to revive - unavoi	dable	
		6110	fee								
. CLAIMS		Exti	FOTAL (1) \$0.00	Fee Palc	141	1,280	241	640	Petition to revive - uninter		
	_		below		142	1,280	242	640	Utility issue fee (or reissu	9)	
otal Claims	-20		X 18 =	\$0.00	143	460	243	230	Design Issue fee		
ndependent Haims	-3=	• 0	X 84 =	\$0.00	144	620	244	310	Plant issue fee		
 fultiple Depende	l int Clain	ns H	x 280 =	\$0.00	122	130 50	122 123	130 50	Petitions to the Commissi		<u> </u>
		~ L				30	123	30	Petitions related to provis applications	iona!	
Large Entity	Small	Entity			126	180	126	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Statement	1	
ee Fee lode (\$)	Fee Code	Fee	Fee Desci	ription	581	40	581	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (rding each patent nment per property (times	
03 50	203	25	Claims in excess of 2	20	148	740	246	370	number of properties) Filing a submission after f		
02 200	202	100	Independent Claims	in excess of 3	3 149	740	249	370	For each additional invent be examined (37 CFR 1.1		
04 290	204	145	Multiple dependent of		ļ.					-,-//	
09 84	209		Reissue Independent original patent	t daims over	Other	fee (specify	·)				
10 18	210	9	Reissue claims in excover original patent	cess of 20 an		her fee (specify)					
		ŞL	JBTOTAL (2) \$0.00		*Redu	iced by Bas	ic Filling F	ee Paid	SUBTOTAL (3)		\$500.00
SUBMITTED BY	—					-			Complete (if appl	icable)	
Typed or Printed Name		Pat:	rick J. G.	Stienn	on			Re	g. Number	349	34
Signature		11	W		Date	May 24,	2006	De	posit Account User ID		
		U									

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REV	Docket Number (Optional)								
FRE-AFFEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REV	FORSAL-25								
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an expense addressed to Mail Stan AF. Commissions of the Commission of the C	Application N	umber		Filed					
in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]	09/966	,424	Ì	Sept	. 28,	2001			
on May 24, 2006		st Named Inventor							
Signature_ Jan V	Kari N	M. Mäki							
· ·	Art Unit		Exa	Examiner					
Typed or printed name Patrick J.G. Stiennon	3629		No	juyen,	Tan.	D.			
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above with this request. This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the atta			No ame	endments	are being	g filed			
Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided and the applicant/inventor. assignee of record of the entire interest.	10	m/2	•	nature					
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)	Pati	rick J.		crinted name					
attorney or agent of record. 34934 Registration number	608	-250-4							
attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.	Mar	24. 7		ne number					
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34		24, 4		Pate					
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.	e Interest or their	representati	ve(s) are	required.					
*Total of forms are submitted.									

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS, SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

MAY 2 4 2006

In The United States Patent And Trademark Office

Applicant: Kari M. Mäki

16082504874

Date: May 24, 2006

Date Filed: Sept. 28, 2001

Docket No.: FORSAL-25

App. No.: 09/966,424

Art Unit: 3629

For:

Maintenance Management System

Examiner: Nguyen, Tan D.

for a Production Plant

Certificate of Facsimile Transmission I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

May 24, 2006

Date

Signature

Patrick J. G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934

Name of applicant, assignee or Registered Representative

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

ARGUMENT

The examiner has failed to consider all the limitations of the claims in making his rejection.

A. The examiner has failed to consider the preamble a positive limitation on the claims.

In the Office action dated Feb. 24, 2006, on p. 3, lines 11-14, and p. 16, lines 9-14, the examiner states:

> Moreover, this limitation [to a paper mill, or board mill or pulp production plant or paper finishing plant] only appears in the preamble and [is] not shown in the body of the claim and therefore, it receives very little patentable weight. If this limitation is critical, it should also appear in the body of the claim.

Applicant: Kari M. Mäki Application No.: 09/966,424

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed May 24, 2006

The claims are limited to a paper mill, or board mill or pulp production plant or paper finishing plant, which is a positive limitation in all the claims because: 1. Applicant has stated on the record that the preamble breathes life and breath into the claims (Amendment Filed Dec. 5, 2005, p. 9, lines 12–15) (see MPEP 2111.02, p. 2100-52, col. 2, lines 31–35); 2. The body of each claim refers to the preamble "production plant" thus making the preamble a positive limitation of the claims; and 3. A paper mill, or board mill or pulp production plant or paper finishing plant have been explicitly set forth as a limitation in the body of claims 20 (twice) and 21(four times).

EP 0 822 473 discloses at Col. 1, lines 6–8: "Maintenance against a trouble in an industrial equipment requiring maintenance, such as a semiconductor device manufacturing apparatus", but not the claimed "paper mill, or board mill or pulp production plant or paper finishing plant". EP 0 822 473 discloses generic industrial equipment "such as a semiconductor device manufacturing apparatus", but that only makes it obvious to try the method disclosed on various manufacturing apparatus but does not make obvious by itself a method for servicing a paper mill, a board mill, a pulp production plant, or a paper finishing plant. But more to the point, EP 0 822 473 teaches performing or managing maintenance on industrial equipment of various types, while applicant's claims are directed to performing additional functional steps with respect to production systems of a paper mill, a board mill, a pulp production plant, or a paper finishing plant.

B. Limitations in the body of the claims not considered by the examiner

<u>Claim 20</u>

a production management system holding specifications of ordered products and passing information to the process control system;

Ordered products as they relate to the claimed system is not addressed by the examiner.

receiving in a reporting system, data from the process control system, the production management system, the

Applicant: Kari M. Mäki Application No.: 09/966,424

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed May 24, 2006

maintenance information system, and the machinery conditioning system, and processing said data into different types of formatted reports;

Processing data into formatted reports is not addressed by the examiner.

scheduling maintenance periods based on the continuous data collection and extending the periods when the units of machinery exhibit continuous operation without any signs of malfunction;

Extending periods of continuous operation is not addressed by the examiner.

Claim 21

continuously gathering data related to manufacturing processes and machinery of the paper mill, or the board mill, or the pulp production plant, or the paper finishing plant by a plurality of information systems comprised of a process control system, a production management system, a maintenance information system, and a machinery condition monitoring system;

The specific control system with four components is not addressed by the examiner.

utilizing a process control system to receive selected target values of variables relating to the production of pulp, paper, board, or paper finishing, and to gather measurement data from process machinery of the paper mill, board mill, pulp production plant or paper finishing plant, and to control said process machinery;

Gathering measurement data of a particular type and control of a particular type of process machinery is not addressed by the examiner.

utilizing a production management system to hold specifications of ordered products and to pass information to the process control system;

Specifications of ordered products and the process steps connected therewith are not addressed by the examiner.

Applicant: Kari M. Mäki Application No.: 09/966,424

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed May 24, 2006

utilizing a machinery condition monitoring system to log process parameters including vibrations, circulating lubrication oil system, bearings, and cleanliness of fabrics;

Logging vibrations, oil systems, bearings and fabrics are not addressed by the examiner.

receiving in a reporting system data from the process control system, the production management system, the maintenance information system, and the machinery conditioning system, and processing said data into different types of formatted reports;

Formatting reports is not addressed by the examiner.

The examiner has not considered these limitations which highlight the differences between EP 0 822 473 and applicant's claimed invention "a paper mill, or board mill or pulp production plant or paper finishing plant". The reference point of EP 0 822 473 is semiconductor device manufacturing which does not suggest applicant's claimed steps which relate to, are informed by, and which claim a method for servicing a paper mill, a board mill, a pulp production plant, or a paper finishing plant.

The standard for a prima facie case of obviousness is set forth at MPEP 706.02 (j) "The initial burden is on the Examiner to provide some suggestion of the desirability of doing what the inventor has done." If the references do not expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention then "the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references."

Continuing to refer to MPEP 706.02 (j) "The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure."

The examiner has, instead of making a prima facie case, argued the references do not specifically exclude applicant's claimed steps, repeatedly referring to open ended language of the EP 0822 473 specification, (see Office Action dated Feb. 24, 2006, p. 4, lines 13–17; p. 9,

Applicant: Kari M. Mäki Application No.: 09/966,424

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed May 24, 2006

lines 10-13; p. 10, lines 12-14, and p. 17, lines 1-6). Finally, the examiner explicitly shifts the burden of making a prima facie case on to the applicant stating "Therefore, applicants have not shown why it's not obvious to apply the teaching [of] EP 0822 473 to other industries." (P. 17, lines 5-6.)

With respect to claim 19, the examiner has failed to consider the preamble as a positive limitation, and with respect to the limitation contained in the preamble has not shown a motivation and expectation of success in applying the teaching of *EP 0822 473* to a paper mill, a board mill, a pulp production plant, or a paper finishing plant. Further with respect to claims 20, and 21 the examiner has additionally failing to make a prima facie case of obviousness for each element of each claim and thus has failed to make his prima facie case with respect to claims 20, and 21.

Allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick J. G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934

Attorney for Applicant Stiennon & Stiennon P.O. Box 1667

Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667

(608) 250-4870 pre-Appeal.res/amdt